



* Required Fields

Letter of Protest
Docket No. 2020-229-E

Date: * March 21, 2021

Protestant Information:

Name * Kristina Kusa

Mailing Address * _____

City, State Zip * Columbia, SC Phone * _____

E-mail _____

1. What is your connection or interest in this case? * For example, are you a customer of the Company that is the subject of this pending proceeding? (This section must be completed. Attach additional information if necessary.)

Current customer of Dominion Energy. I installed a rooftop solar system approximately two years ago.

2. Please give a concise statement of your protest. * (This section must be completed. Attach additional information if necessary.)

Please see attachment.

3. Do you wish to make an appearance at a hearing in this proceeding , if scheduled, and offer sworn testimony? *

I will be unable to make an appearance, but I appreciate your consideration of my statement.

Signature Required:

Kristina Kusa

I watched some of the hearings held on this matter and have three points I would like to address with regard to the arguments presented. Dominion has argued repeatedly that this proposal will not "kill" or be detrimental to the solar industry. I disagree. Across the country, the evidence is clear that in states where net metering has been curtailed or eliminated, the number of new solar installations has plummeted. I can also state that if I were facing the decision today on whether to install rooftop solar based on the rate plan currently proposed by Dominion, I would choose to NOT make that installation because I would be unable to recoup a significant portion of such a massive upfront investment. In short, some incentive must exist to encourage the expansion of this market, and the proposed program essentially eliminates any incentive to customers to do so.

Additionally, Dominion offered much testimony on its commitment to reach net zero carbon emissions by the year 2050. Somewhat insultingly, it also presented expert testimony that the portion of its solar power contribution by residential customers is "not significant." I believe such a statement is short-sighted and discouraging in light of the company's stated goals. If solar rooftop installation were made more attractive and customers were encouraged to consider this option instead of being charged high fees and penalties for their contributions, Dominion would be able to achieve its goal to the benefit of all customers. Notably, not every Dominion customer who would like to install rooftop solar is able to. A customer must own their own home, the home must meet the specifications for rooftop solar installation, and the owner must be able to afford the hefty up-front monetary investment. However, many customers who can't meet these requirements still strongly support the solar industry and realize that these investments in green energy benefit every customer in the state of South Carolina. Before I made the decision to install solar, I did not begrudge the charge on my electric bill that contributed to the development and expansion of the solar industry in South Carolina.

Finally, there has been much testimony presented on interpreting the legislative intent behind S.C. Code Ann. § 58-40-20(G)(1) which directs the Commission to "eliminate any cost shift to the greatest extent practicable." I would ask the Commissioners to consider the larger statewide and global picture when interpreting the meaning of "the greatest extent practicable." Utilities are some of the single largest producers of greenhouse gas emissions in the world, and the quicker these emissions can be reduced, the better off all South Carolinians will be. If reducing or eliminating the cost shift delays or prevents the solar market from expanding, we all will pay a much higher price.

Thank you for your time and consideration.